DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 390 UD 017 552

AUTHOR	Evans, John W.
TITLE	Statement by John W. Evans before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	18 Oct 77
NOTE	45p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Conceptual Schemes; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; *Federal Programs; Minority Groups; *Models; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This statement describes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I's evaluation effort. Evaluation activities are mandated by Section 151 of the Act and are varied and complex. The evaluation efforts focus as a first priority on improving local and state evaluation activities. The efforts involve the development of evaluation models, the provision of technical assistance services, and the drafting of regulations. The work with models spans all aspects of Title I, and the assistance includes national workshops, handbooks, and free consulting services. Second in priority are the national studies. Their purpose is to provide information about the program's effects which is not obtainable through the local and state educational agencies (LEA's and SEA's) reporting system. The current approach to evaluation is one which relies on data generated by two strategies: the reporting of comparable project data from LEA's through SEA's and the conduct of national studies. The former provide more current information while national reports are more in depth. The major portion of the evaluation effort involves activities to improve state and local evaluations. Briefly stated, these activities include the development of uniform valid models, the provision of technical assistance, and the drafting of regulations. Various evaluation models and how they were developed are given. Use of the models is increasing, and the current estimate is that about 40% of the nations' school districts are using them to evaluate their Title I projects for the school year. The paper includes data from national studies about two aspects of Title I: the services being provided and the effects of those services. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

ED147390

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Statement by
John W. Evans
Assistant Commissioner, Office of Planning,
Budgeting, and Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Before the
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education
of the Committee on Education and Labor
United States House of Representatives
Tuesday, October 18, 1977
10:30 a.m.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Evans is accompanied by:

Mr. William A. Blakey, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Education), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

UD017552

I appreciate the opportunity to appear today before this Committee to describe our work in evaluating Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Our activities are mandated by Section 151 of that Act and are varied and complex. I have prepared a substantial statement for you but want to highlight at the beginning the main points contained in it.

Section 151 directs the Commissioner to standardize State and local evaluations of their Title I projects and to conduct--as after accomplishing that goal--national studies of the effectiveness of the program. Consequently, our efforts focus as a first priority on improving local and State evaluation activities. We are involved in the development of evaluation models, the provision of technical assistance services, and the drafting of regulations. Furthermore, the work with models spans all aspects of Title I, and the assistance includes national workshops, handbooks, and free consulting services. We have seen the use of our models grow from selected sites in about 20 States last year to approximately 40% of the nation's Title I school districts this year.

Second in priority in our program to implement Section 151 are our national studies. Their purpose is to provide information about the program's effects which is not obtainable through the LEA and SEA reporting system. We have shared with you the findings

from these evaluations as they become available and intend to continue that practice in the future. I have reviewed some of our findings at the close of my prepared statement and will proceed now with the more detailed descriptions of our work.

The "Declaration of Policy" of ESEA Title I states its purpose as "meeting the needs of educationally deprived children," and in the years since its enactment, appropriations have grown from $949 million to over $2 billion. Early data on Title I indicated that funds were not being focused on providing compensatory services to educationally disadvantaged youngsters. Our recent studies have shown, however, that the funds are being used primarily in the areas of remedial education in the basic skills.

Evaluation of the impact of Title I services is required at all three administrative levels: local, State and Federal. A local educational agency must by law assure its State -

> "that effective procedures, including provisions for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Similarly, a State must assure the U.S. Commissioner of Education

> "that the State educational agency will make ... periodic reports ... evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children..."

Of course, the Commissioner of Education is required by Section 417 of the General Education Provisions Act to report to Congress annually on the effectiveness of all educational programs in achieving their legislated goals. We draw on information from all sources to prepare that report but have been unable to make much use of State data because many States did very little in the way of evaluating Title I, and even those who did often committed errors which invalidated their findings.

We initiated a project in June of 1974 to correct the problem of inaccurate evaluation reporting in ESEA, Title I, and our work in that area was given greater emphasis the following August with the passage of the Education Amendments of 1974. Title I was thereby amended to include Section 151 which lists specific activities required of the Commissioner of Education in the evaluation of the program. The subsections of Section 151 can be summarized as follows:

"The Commissioner shall

(a) provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title ...

(b) develop and publish standards for evaluation of program or project effectiveness ...

(c) where appropriate, consult with State agencies in order to provide for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies ...

(d) provide to State educational agencies, models for evaluations of all programs conducted under this title ... which shall include uniform procedures and criteria to be utilized by local educational agencies, as well as by the State agency ...;

(e) provide such technical and other assistance as may be necessary to State educational agencies to enable them to assist local educational agencies in the development and application of a systematic evaluation of programs in accordance with the models developed by the Commissioner;

(f) develop a system for the gathering and dissemination of results of evaluations and for the identification of exemplary programs."

Subsection (f) of Section 151 describes the models further as specifying "objective criteria" and "outlining techniques and methodology" for producing data which are "comparable on a state-wide and nationwide basis." Subsection(g) requires a periodic report on the activities of this Section, and subsection (i) provides for funding to support these activities (as well as those of the National Institute of Education during fiscal years 75, 76, and 77 for their study mandated in Section 821 of Public Law 93-380).

Subsection (i) as amended by the Education Amendments of 1976 also clarifies funding priorities of Section 151 in the Office

of Education, and our program is organized so as to reflect them. I will describe that organization of activities in my testimony today -- first, in general terms and then with greater detail about the work to upgrade SEA and LEA evaluation practices and to evaluate the program nationally. I will also summarize our findings about the program.

As an overview of our Section 151 program, let me begin by observing that the evaluation of ESEA, Title I has historically involved a variety of approaches. Efforts at the Federal level have ranged from the sole reliance on LEA reporting of raw data to the conduct of national studies which are designed in-house by methodologists on my staff and conducted by outside contractors selected competitively. Our current approach is one which relies on data generated by two strategies: the reporting of comparable project data from LEA's through SEA's and the conduct of national studies.

I will briefly review the strengths and weaknesses of both strategies for producing data about Title I because I think they are important for understanding our approach to implementing Section 151.

We view the adequacy of information for decision-makers according to seven criteria: the frequency with which it can be collected or updated; its breadth; its depth; the cost to acquire it; the number of local administrators who can use it; its usefulness at the Federal level; and, of course, its accuracy. It is not difficult to see how the two strategies (aggregating locally generated evaluation data and use of data from national studies) differ according to those criteria.

On one hand, the annual reporting by LEA's and States produces more current information than do national studies (which are conducted by necessity less often). Furthermore, that reporting yields data about a greater number of Title I sites than do national studies. In contrast, however, national studies--because they are less frequent and less universal in their coverage of sites--allow the investigation in more depth of project activities and which ones lead to which types of incomes. Similarly, the sampling, concentration of overhead costs, etc., possible with national studies make them less costly in comparison to project and SEA reporting.

Project and SEA reports will continue, we feel, to be more useful to local administrators than will the results of national studies due to their greater immediacy, etc. However, our national studies are more controlled and in general of higher methodological quality; therefore, they yield data which are more useful for assessing the program nationally. We feel that data at the national level produced by aggregating across LEA and SEA reports will be less accurate and, hence, less useful for policy-making. Table I summarizes these trade-offs.

Table 1
Comparison of Evaluation and Reporting System with National Evaluations

Characteristics of the information	Evaluation and Reporting System	National Evaluations
1. Frequency	greater	less
2. Number of sites covered	many or all	few but representative
3. Depth of investigation	shallow (can't relate program operations to outcomes)	in-depth (can answer policy issues)
4. Cost	annual cost great	annual cost much less
5. Usefulness to locals and States	useful	re: general findings only
6. Usefulness for Federal policy-making	less useful	more useful
7. Accuracy	less	more

Hence, we believe that the thrust in the present legislation is correct in requiring that data about the effectiveness of ESEA Title I come from both local and State reporting and the conduct of national studies.

Whereas our early efforts in implementing this Section prompted concerns on the part of various members of Congress and their staffs that we were concentrating on the latter at the expense of the former, I believe the pattern of our allocation of monies to various activities as well as our report of progress to date indicate that such is not the case. I will sketch briefly the uses of funds to implement Section 151 and then describe our work supported by those funds.

The provisions of Section 151 are supported by a set-aside not to exceed one-half of one percent of the Title I appropriation annually; it has averaged just over .4 of one percent for the years 1957-78, and over 63% of the U.S. Office of Education portion (including funds from the Planning and Evaluation appropriation) has been directed toward improving State and local evaluation practices as required by the Section. Figures reflecting uses of the funds over the four-year period are shown in an Attachment to this statement.

Table 2

Total 151 set-aside FY 75-78	$34.4 million
NIE appropriation for mandated study	-15.0" (about 44% of the total)
USOE portion	$19.4 million
USOE supplement from P & E funds	+ 1.0
USOE total to implement Section	$20.4 million
Funds to upgrade evaluation practices	12.2 "(a little over 63% of USOE total)
Funds for national evaluations	$ 8.2 million

Of the $20.4 million available to the Office of Education (including $19.4 million from the set-aside and an additional $1 million from Planning and Evaluation monies), over $12 million have been used to upgrade State and local Title I evaluation practices by supporting the development of evaluation models and the provision of technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs. The remainder, about $8 million, has been used for an evaluation of the Title I migrant program, an examination of Title I impact across school-years, and an evaluation of the Title I handicapped program.

Having sketched the funding for this program, I'd like next to describe the major portion of our work, our activities to improve State and local evaluations. Briefly stated those activities consist of the development of uniform valid models for use in evaluating various Title I activities, the provision of technical assistance in support of their use, and the drafting of regulations. Each area of effort is substantial, and I will describe them in more detail for you.

In drafting Section 151, members of Congress were aware, as were we, of the many deficiencies in local and State Title I evaluation reports. To address this problem they mandated the Commissioner to develop and aid the use of technically valid evaluation procedures formulated as models. Much of our work has focused on their development and implementation.

ESEA, Title I is a complex program trying to meet several types of student needs in a variety of settings. In our work to develop evaluation models, we focused initially on student progress in the basic skills and on projects supported by the LEA grant portion of Title I. More recently, efforts have begun to develop models for evaluating student progress in achievement in State institutions for neglected or delinquent youth and in the State-administered migrant education program.

Of course, some projects address objectives in addition to improving students' achievement, so we are working also on evaluation models focusing on non-achievement types of outcomes. They fall into the areas of students' affective development; their improvements related to nutritional, medical or dental, and psychological or social services; and their progress due to early childhood education. Project administrators are also requesting advice on the evaluation of parent involvement and fidelity of project implementation, and plans are underway to meet those requests. I have summarized in Table 3 various efforts to develop evaluation models in eight areas.

Some of the issues in evaluating the effects of services in migrant education, in institutions for the neglected or delinquent, and in early childhood projects are similar to those addressed in the development of evaluation models for regular school projects. For example, in all cases current evaluation activities need to be documented in order that recommended models can incorporate, as possible, proceduures already in use. Similarly, preliminary ideas regarding proposed models must be discussed with program administrators before plans are finalized for their use. I have listed in Table 4 the steps in the process to develop evaluation models and the timing of them for various program areas.

Of course, different settings also have unique evaluation problems, and we address them in the separate projects. I will briefly describe each of our contracts to develop evaluation models and

Table 3. The Development of Evaluation Models

Type of outcome and program:	Status as of Fall, 1977
1. Achievement:	
Basic LEA grant program	- models available, in use in about 40% of the nation's Title I school districts in 1977-78; increased use encouraged in subsequent years; regulations in effect probably by 1980.
Migrant education program	- being developed in conjunction with national evaluation study; to be discussed with administrators 1978-79.
Program for the Neglected or Delinquent	- being developed in national evaluation study; to be discussed with administrators 1977-78.
2. Student non-cognitive outcomes	
a. affective development	- handbook on techniques available late fall, 1977.
b. nutritional, medical, dental, psychological, social improvements	- work planned for 1977-78 to prepare handbook.
c. early childhood education	- work beginning in fall, 1977 to survey project objectives and develop evaluation models
3. Non-student outcomes	
a. parent involvement	- work planned for FY 79 to address parent satisfaction
b. project implementation	- plans are being formulated to specify good procedures for assessing project management.

Table 4 Steps in the process to develop evaluation models

Steps	Regular School Program	Neglected/ Delinquent	Migrant	Early childhood	Affective	Non-Instructional Services
1. Define information needs and review current practices.	summer 74	spring 76	winter 77	fall 77	fall 76	spring 77
2. Develop preliminary ideals and discuss with program personnel	spring 75	summer 78	winter 79	fall 78	summer 77	spring 78
3. Assess needs for technical assistance and begin specific services as needed	fall 76	winter 79	spring 80	summer 79	winter 78	winter 79

encourage you to request more information about any of particular interest to you.

You have by now heard of the work we have supported to develop the evaluation models for regular school projects. The models are sets of procedures prescribing test administration, timing, selection and use of a basis of comparison (other children's test scores), analysis, and reporting. The three being used now in regular school projects differ according to how they estimate the Title I participants' growth had they not received compensatory education services. The estimate may be based on national norms, test scores of local children similar to those in Title I, or scores of children dissimilar to Title I students (in which case we make necessary statistical adjustments); and, of course, the procedures for testing, analysis, and reporting vary accordingly.

The use of each model allows a local district to estimate the effects in the basic skills performance of their children attributable to participation in Title I. Hence, each district produces a Title I project evaluation for reading, math and/or language arts for its own use as well as for its required reporting to the State. Of course, districts and States may want to augment the standard evaluation model with information needed at those administrative levels, and they are encouraged to do so. But the cognitive outcomes of the Title I projects will be evaluated by use of our methods "for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis" as subsection(f) of Section 151 requires.

In order to make the data comparable, project evaluations are expressed in a common metric which we are calling "Normal Curve Equivalents." The use of a common metric is necessary for aggregation across project estimates, and we feel it will serve that purpose well. I must note that some critics have claimed we are trying to "equate achievement tests." That is not correct; as I have tried to explain above, conversion to the common metric is the last of a series of operations and merely translates estimates of gain into one scale for reporting purposes.

Use of the models is increasing, and our current estimate is that about 40% of the nation's school districts are using them to evaluate their Title I projects this school year. Attachment II shows how their use varies by region of the country. We have an effort underway to examine districts' experiences with the models last year, and I hope to have a progress report on that topic to share with you by next February.

Our work to develop evaluation models applicable to the Title I migrant education program is underway now. We will have some results from that effort to report about a year from now. It looks currently as though we will rely on the storage and retrieval capabilities of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System to facilitate the evaluation and reporting, but specific details regarding testing and analysis are yet to be defined.

Similarly, our national evaluation of Title I in State institutions for the neglected or delinquent includes the development of evaluation models as well as assessment of the impacts of the program nationwide. A primary concern in that setting is the inappropriateness of typical achievement tests because the students are usually teen-agers whose skills in reading and math fall into the primary grade levels. That means that a typical commercially available test with items at the appropriate difficulty levels will be inappropriate (too juvenile, insulting) in content. We are fairly confident that the solution to this problem for the national evaluation will also be helpful as part of evaluation models for use by others and that we can discuss these with program personnel next spring and summer.

Title I supports some early childhood projects which usually focus on improving pre-schoolers' academic readiness, and less often, their social skills and psychomotor development. A project to develop models to evaluate such efforts has just begun. It will involve visits to several project sites and States to determine their evaluation problems and possible solutions.

Similarly, our work in developing models to evaluate non-instructional services has relied heavily on visits to projects where such activities are underway. During our discussions with State personnel, about 1/3 of them showed interest in evaluation models for this area, so we are now pulling together for a handbook various techniques being used by project personnel in the areas of guidance and counseling; social services; and medical and dental help. We hope to complete it in the

next year. A similar search for instruments and techniques to measure student affective growth is complete now, and a handbook will be available later this fall.

It is important to note that in the areas of non-instructional services and children's affective development, there is less uniformity across project objectives than there is in the basic skills area. Therefore, we anticipate that eventual reporting about such project effects may involve lists of objectives attempted-versus-achieved rather than aggregation of actual outcome data.

We are just now planning work to define evaluation models regarding parent involvement to begin next year. In addition to these various types of Title I outcomes, there has been considerable concern about assessing the mere question of whether projects were actually implemented. We hope to address such concerns beginning next year.

Of course, a major technical assistance effort is necessary to get the models into use and used correctly. Members of my staff are active in maintaining contact with various program personnel nationwide and make many visits and presentations in support of the use of our models. We rely also on the help of outside contractors mainly in the conduct of national workshops, the preparation of publications, and the provision of on-site technical advice regarding evaluation practices.

The national evaluation workshops were offered in ten locations during the late fall and early winter of 1976-77. States sent about four staff members, on the average, to the three-day sessions which involved presentations on research methodology and the evaluation models. Participants also worked through examples and discussed particular implementation situations. The workshop materials are made available upon request, and have been very popular for use by others such as State and school personnel in conducting their own training sessions.

The handbooks in our monograph series are also distributed widely. Two are currently available from the Government Printing Office, and two more will come out this winter. They discuss the planning and conduct of evaluations, the validation of results, the estimation of project costs, and the assessment of children's affective development. Others will address problems of examining achievement tests for bias, of managing a large-scale testing program, and of using criterion-referenced tests. They will become available throughout the next year.

Another popular document is our quarterly newsletter. It is sent to all States and school districts nationwide and describes activities at the Federal level. It also includes columns written by State and local personnel in an attempt to begin a dialogue about evaluations

of Title I. Occasionally a parent is also invited to write an article about his or her experience reviewing evaluation reports, etc.

As you know, we have established ten Technical Assistance Centers under contract to us to provide specific, on-site evaluation advice. Because of the scope of this effort and the important role the Centers are playing, I have chosen to describe their activities in some detail.

They have been in operation since late September, 1976. TAC personnel provide free consulting services to SEAs (and under the SEA's direction, to LEAs) in all aspects of Title I program evaluation. The majority of these services are directed toward helping clients to evaluate their reading and mathematics Title I programs, although occasionally they advise on other Title I evaluation areas.

The history of their selection illustrates our intention from the start to select persons for this work who could best interact with the States. We decided early to award contracts to organizations through regular competitive procurement procedures, and to have ten competitions--a TAC to serve the States in each HEW regional area.

A separate competition was held for each region because it was thought--and still is--that TAC personnel should be familiar with the programs and personnel of the area that they would serve. Thus in the final RFP, 40% of the selection points were devoted to

"successful regional knowledge and experience" and 40% to applied technical skills. We contacted Title I evaluation and program personnel in all States during the screening process to assess the offerors' expertise in these areas.

In addition, in almost all cases, an SEA representative from within the region (usually the State with the largest Title I funding) and a representative from the HEW regional office were present during negotiations to question offerors on their knowledge of regional programs. I have listed the selected institutions.

We have required that the TAC assigned to each State reach a written agreement with the SEA concerning the conditions under which it will provide services to the State and the kinds of services it will provide. For example, each SEA and its TAC have determined jointly how LEAs and the TAC should interact. In most cases the State agreement, which can be renegotiated periodically, reflects the most feasible ways of providing services to the LEAs in the State, but in a few cases it reflects the SEA's apprehension concerning Federal personnel or a Federal congractor working directly with LEAs.* Thus, within the constraints required to

*To help allay SEA fears of Federal intervention, and to be sure that the TACs are helping clients to build local expertise, TAC personnel are forbidden from advising clients on USOE or SEA policies, enforcing Title I program regulations, recommending specific copyrighted achievement tests, actually performing Title I evaluations, writing Title I evaluation reports, or providing advice not related to Title I program evaluation.

Table 5

TITLE I EVALUATION
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS
PROJECT DIRECTORS

Region I

Dr. Everett W. Barnes, Jr.
RMC Research Corporation
62 Congress Street
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801
(603) 436-5385

Region II

Dr. Gary J. Echternacht
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
(609) 921-9000 x2566

Region III

Dr. Joan Troy
National Testing Service, Inc.
1905 Chapel Hill Road
Durham, North Carolina 27705
(919) 493-3451

Region IV

Dr. George Temp
Educational Testing Service - Southern Regional Office
3445 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Suite 1040
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404) 262-7637

Region V

Dr. Theodore Storlie
Educational Testing Service - Midwest Regional Office
960 Grove Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(312) 869-7700

Region VI

Dr. George Powell
Resource Development Institute, Inc.
1916 Justin Lane
Austin, Texas 78757
(512) 454-5751
(512) 454-4227

Region VII

Dr. Carmen Finley
American Institutes for Research
PO Box 1113
Palo Alto, California 94302
(415) 493-3550
(415) 494-0224

Region VIII, IX, X

Dr. Joe Hansen
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 248-6853

be sure that an SEA will proceed in a positive manner to meet the requirements of Section 151, each SEA can determine the areas of consulting services to be emphasized by its TAC.

The first three months of TAC services consisted primarily of outreach efforts to the States. Even in States which were extremely receptive to the notion of assistance for Title I evaluation, the SEA personnel had to decide which services they wished emphasized.

For those SEAs whose initial reaction to Federal technical assistance was less than enthusiastic (even with the SEA determining the services to be provided), reaching an agreement often required several months. However, the TACs have signed an agreement with each State and have provided some services to all.

Generally, after reaching an agreement with the TAC, initial services have included overview workshops for SEA and LEA personnel. These have been followed by regional meetings for groups of LEAs and more detailed workshops on specific aspects of the models. In addition to the large amount of time spent responding to questions on the telephone, TACs have made visits and acted as on-site consultants to some large school districts.

As of June 30, more than 50% of the approximately 14,000 school districts receiving Title I funds have received some TAC services, and approximately 40% of them will attempt this year to use the models. I have included an attachment to my written testimony

showing the progress in use of the models as it varies by region and State. I should also point out: (1) that many LEAs are receiving training this fall and are hence not shown on any tabulation; (2) that LEA's attempting to use our models may not be doing so correctly; and (3) that in some cases the number of LEA's having been trained is greater than we show because of the work of personnel in intermediate districts (whom we trained).

In the next few months the TACs will give additional workshops on specific areas of the USOE Title I models for LEAs using them this school year. They will also be spending more hours in providing telephone assistance and on-site consulting as LEAs encounter specific problems. We have also found that other Title I programs besides those in reading and math in regular schools are increasing their requests for help, and we anticipate increased need for help in interpreting results next spring.

The first contract period for the TAC's extends through December, 1977 (contracts funded for 15 months), and the total funding for the ten contracts during that period was about $2,420,000. All of the TACs will be funded for an additional 15 months (there was a 15-month extension clause in each contract). Although it is difficult to predict accurately the demands by SEAs and LEAs for TAC services, we are estimating currently that over $5,000,000 will be required for the January, 1978-March, 1979 contract period. If some of the States which have been cautious in their implementation of the USOE system should make large demands for services during the contract period, then the funding will be increased accordingly.

In short, our experiences thus far with the Centers show that their services are welcomed and needed, and we intend to make them a continuing important part of our evaluation system. They appear to be helping in quality control as well as in State and Federal relationships. Indeed, the provision of useful services (free of charge) has caused much of the early skepticism about our models to change to enthusiasm.

Finally, in discussing our activities to upgrade State and local evaluation practices, it is important for me to mention our intentions to publish program regulations in this area. I anticipate that there will be some negative reactions to such regulations, but we plan to proceed this Fall to publish a Notice of Intent to Regulate. Preliminary meetings have been held with a group of State Title I Coordinators and other administrators representing Chief State School Officers to discuss the process; a Notice of Intent will solicit comments about specific issues from all interested parties. After the publication of Proposed Rules (probably in late Spring, 1978), hearings will be held in locations across the nation, and regulations will follow. Their issuance will affect the use of the evaluation models at that time in the few districts not already using them, making nationwide implementation of the system most probable by 1980 or 1981.

All of this, Mr. Chairman, is what we have been doing to implement the requirements in Section 151 dealing with the improvement of State and local evaluations. I would like to turn now to the data we have available, primarily from our national studies, about two aspects of Title I: the services being provided and the effects of those services.

What have we learned from national evaluations of Title I?

About the LEA grant portion of Title I

With respect to students served and serviced offered?

- Currently, 90% of all public school districts in the U.S. receive Title I funds and of the nation's public elementary schools (those having one or more grades in the 1-6 range)
  - .. 67% receive funds from Title I while another 15% receive compensatory funds from sources other than Title I
  - .. Schools that receive Title I funds have high concentrations of students from poverty backgrounds and high concentrations of poor readers.
- Approximately 15 percent of all public elementary school students receive compensatory assistance from Title I with another 9 percent receiving compensatory services from sources other than Title I.
  - .. Only 14 percent of all public elementary school students attend a school that does not offer compensatory assistance (either from Title I or from other sources)
- Slightly less than one-third of the students from poverty families receive services from Title I; an additional 9 percent receive services from sources other than Title I.
  - .. Almost 12 percent of non-poor students receive services from Title I with another 9 percent receiving services from sources other than Title I.
  - .. Although there are proportionately more poverty than non-poverty students served by Title I, due to their greater absolute numbers more non-poor than poor are served by Title I
- Using a criterion of achieving one or more years below grade level(for students in grades 2-6),
  - .. if a student comes from a poverty background the chances are almost 1 in 2 that he or she will be a low achiever

- .. if a student comes from a non-poverty background the chances are almost 1 in 5 that he or she will be a low achiever

- .. however, in absolute numbers there are about one million more low achievers than there are students from poverty backgrounds

- Among low achieving students (using the previous criterion) almost one-third received services from Title I with another 14 percent receiving services from sources other than Title I

  - .. In contrast, 11 percent of regular (or non-low) achieving students receive services under Title I with another 8 percent receiving services from sources other than Title I

  - .. However, because of their greater absolute numbers, slightly more regular than low achieving students receive services from Title I (about 100,000 more).

- Seventy-six percent of the Title I per-pupil dollar is used to provide instructional services (NIE)

  - .. Eighty-two percent of all compensatory students participate in a remedial reading project or in a language arts project that has a reading component with the next most frequent areas of instructional activity being compensatory mathematics and preschool/kindergarten readiness activities (NIE)

  - .. The predominant mode of instruction for compensatory services is via a "pull-out" program (viz. students leave their regular classroom for compensatory instruction) (NIE)

- With respect to compensatory reading instruction, the lowest achieving students are the ones who receive special assistance with such assistance being supplementary to resources used in the regular reading program.

With respect to the benefits of these services?

- Students who receive compensatory assistance in reading tended not to fall behind their less needy, unassisted peers in their reading skill performance during the school year. For some of the achievement tests, compensatory students were closer to non-compensatory students in their reading test performance in the Spring than they had been in the preceding Fall.

  - Compensatory assisted students tended to develop favorable attitudes toward themselves as readers and toward their reading activities to a degree that was equal to or greater than that of their less needy, unassisted peers.

  - For specially selected sites, dramatic compensatory student improvement in reading (OPBE and NIE) and in mathematics (NIE) was observed.

  - These results can be contrasted with those from earlier studies which showed that disadvantaged students fell progressively further behind in their reading performance and became increasingly more fatalistic about their ability to improve their life circumstances through education.

  - However, a clear relationship between the level of resources utilized and student improvement in reading was <u>not</u> discerned. Rather, given a minimal level of resources, the ways in which they were utilized appeared more important than the sheer amount (e.g., the use of instructional aides for instructional activities rather than for clerical or custodial functions).

- In the Fall of the year students who recieved compensatory assistance in grades 2, 4 and 6 were at about the same percentile rank. Such results may reflect; (1) the emphasis of the program on serving the most educationally needy students each year and they are not necessarily the same students from one year to the next; and, (2) a loss over the summer months of the proficiencies acquired during the regular school year.

  - Disadvantaged students who attended summer school did not exhibit such a loss. However, summer attendance was voluntary; the most severely disadvantaged students did not attend; and, student instructional cost was two and one-half times greater during the summer months than during the regular school year.

- Very little is known about student benefits in other areas supported by Title I (e.g. methematics, support services, services to secondary school students) nor of the extent to which gains in basic skills acquired during a single school year are sustained over the summer months and in subsequent years--this latter is the topic of a current national evaluation especially designed to follow-up on the gains that this earlier study indicated were acquired during one school year.

About programs conducted by State educational agencies?

Title I funds are also used to provide services to: (1) neglected or delinquent youth in State institutions; (2) children of migratory agricultural workers and fishermen; and, (3) severely handicapped children in State institutions. Results from the first descriptive phase of an ongoing study of the neglected or delinquent program has shown that:

- Nearly 27,000 institutionalized youth receive Title I services compared to just over 51,000 estimated as eligible for the program.
- Title I students are younger than the general institutionalized population; nearly 2/3 are under 18 years of age.
- Services in reading and mathematics account for nearly 70% of the Title I expenditures in the facilities.
- Per-pupil expenditures for Title I students averaged about $1358 of which about $456 was from Title I; however, these figures fluctuate greatly across sites.
- Opinions about the program were very positive with strengths most often mentioned in its emphasis on basic skills and individualized instruction; weaknesses cited most frequently were the restrictive guidelines and insufficient funds.

The next phase of this study will address the effects of the program on participants' performance in the basic skills and attitudinal development. Evaluation models will also be developed for use by State and project personnel in assessing and reporting Title I impacts in their sites.

Although there is no current evaluative information on the migrant and handicapped programs under Title I a comprehensive study of the former program is currently in process while a study of the latter program is planned for the near future.

Summary

In summary evidence now available indicates that the receipt of Title I funds is almost universal at the school district level and exceptionally widespread at the elementary school level. A remarkably high percentage of elementary schools with high concentrations of poverty students (which also have high concentrations of low achieving students) receive Title I funds although many schools with low concentrations of such students do too. The funds are used for a wide variety of instructional and support services; however, the vast bulk of the funds and students are involved in basic skills instruction in the elementary grades. With respect to reading, the evidence suggests that in elementary schools, Title I has been well-targeted on children who read poorly and Title I is probably having some positive impact. Educationally disadvantaged children usually lose ground to their more advantaged peers as they progress through school. However, poor readers who received extra attention because of Title I and similar programs tend to hold their relative positions between Fall and Spring and on some tests they gain ground. But, the extent to which such gains are sustained in subsequent years for the same students is not currently known. Some limited evidence suggests there may be losses over the summer months. In general, then, the reading results illustrate modest success but with much work still to be done. Little useful information is currently available on student achievement in other areas. Many of the non-instructional services provided are desirable ends in themselves (e.g. having healthy, well-fed, well-clothed children) for which Title I should receive credit for providing assistance when these needs cannot be met from other sources. However, little is known about how children benefit from these services.

Although the main evaluative judgments about the efffectiveness of Title I should be based directly upon the services provided to participating children, the impact of the program should also be considered in a larger sense. As the major Federal program aimed at improving the education of disadvantaged children, Title I has been instrumental in drawing the attention of educators and the public to the plight of these children. Although the problems of providing an adequate education for the disadvantaged have not yielded to solution as swiftly as had been hoped, that very fact has led to further efforts. States have initiated compensatory programs, school districts have tightened up their programs, parents have become more involved in their children's education, and researchers have pursued many new approaches to learning. There is a much greater national consciousness about the education of disadvantaged children than there was 15 years ago and Title I is certainly a central feature of this awareness.

ATTACHMENT I Funding of activities
FY 74-7

	74*	75	76	77	Estimated 78
I. To upgrade State evaluation practices					
Technical assistance					$6760
Workshops			$ 365		
Centers			1,134	$920	
Publications	$22		44	60	
Development of Evaluation Models					960
Basic skills	912		36		
Non-instructional services			376		
Migrant education			26	119	
Neglected/Delinquent				255	
Early childhood education				50	
Implementation			15	50	140
Total, Category I	934		1,996=62%	1454=40%	7860=71%
II. To evaluate the program nationally					3140
Sustaining Effects Study		1,400	900	1,524	
Migrant education evaluation			316	772	
Handicapped					
Total, Category II		1,400	1,216	2,296	3140
Total, USOE portion of 151 set-aside		$1,400	$3,250	$3,750	$11,000
* Planning and Evaluation Funds, 1974	$ 934				

ATTACHMENT II

Region and Number of LEAs	US Approximate % of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
Region I 893 LEAs	81	90	61	5 days
Region II 1267 LEAs	4	13	4	28 days
Region III 748 LEAs	3	21	80	8 days
Region IV 1098 LEAs	22	45	84	5 days
Region V 3126 LEAs	3	29	34	4 days
Region VI 2166 LEAs	46	48	51	9 days
Region VII 1379 LEAs	3	80	78	3 days
Region VIII 959 LEAs	33	55	86	4 days
Region IX 1257 LEAs	1	7	44	2 days
Region X 736 LEAs	14	29	73	4 days
NATIONAL AVERAGE 13,629 LEAs	19 (2617)	40 (5394)	53 (7742)	5 days

REGION I

State and Number Of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
Connecticut 140 districts	25	54	21	3
Maine 154 districts	97	100	20	4
Massachusetts 340 districts	94	100	90	5
New Hampshire 165 districts	100	100	90	11
Rhode Island 40 districts	18	50	45	3
Vermont 54 districts	93	100	28	4
REGIONAL AVERAGE	81	90	61	5

REGION II

State and Number of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
New Jersey 490 LEAs	0	8	8	5 days
New York 736 LEAs	3	15	0	2 days
Puerto Rico 30 LEAs	100	100	20	20 days
Virgin Islands 1 LEA	0	100	100	1 day
REGIONAL AVERAGE	4	13	4	28 days

REGION III

State and Number of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in:		% of LEAs Trained by:	# of days of Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by:
	1976-77	1977-78	6/30/77	6/30/77
Delaware 23 LEAs	78	100	100	13
Maryland 24 LEAs	0	29	0	5
Pennsylvania 505 LEAs	0	2	100	5
Virginia 140 LEAs	0	30	30	5
West Virginia 55 LEAs	9	100	100	15
District of Columbia 1 LEA	100	100	100	3
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE	3	21	80	

REGION IV

State and Number of LEAs	Approximate percentage of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	Percentages of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Days of Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
Alabama 127 districts	100	100	100	6
Florida 67 districts	20	35	100	5
Georgia 187 districts	1	15	100	7
Kentucky 181 districts	0	2	0	1
Mississippi 152 districts	2	30	100	5
North Carolina 145 districts	4	20	100	4
South Carolina 92 districts	100	100	100	4
Tennessee 147 districts	2	100	100	7
Regional Average	22	45	83.5	4.87

REGION V

State and Number of Title I LEAS	% of LEAs Implementing One of Evaluation Models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Days of Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
Illinois: 797 Districts	0%	7%	29% *	8
Indiana: 302 Districts	0	40	100	4
Michigan: 575 Districts	0	0	0	1
Minnesota: 439 Districts	0	13	13*	3
Ohio: 625 Districts	100	100	64	3
Wisconsin: 388 Districts	0	15	15*	3
Regional (3126 Districts) Average	3.2%	29.4%	33.7%	3.7

* Includes districts having 70% of students in Title I programs in state.

State and Number of LEA's	Approximate % of LEA's implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEA's Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel
Arkansas 385 districts	100%	100%	100%	9 days
Louisiana 66 parishes	0	10%	100%	13 days
New Mexico 86 districts	0	22%	22%	7 days
Oklahoma 612 districts	100%	100%	100%	4 days
Texas 1017 districts	0	1%	1%	11 days
Regional Averages	46%	48%	51%	8.8 days

REGION VII

State and Number of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs implementing one of the evaluation models in: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA Personnel by 6/30/77
Iowa 440 districts	9	45	77	6
Kansas 250 districts	0	100	100	1.5
Missouri 389 districts	1	90	55	1
Nebraska 300 districts	0	100	75	4
REGIONAL AVERAGE	3	80	78	3

REGION VIII

ate and umber of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs Implementing one of the Evaluation Models In: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistance for SEA personnel by 6/30/77
olorado 72 districts	0	7	75	4
lontana 50 districts	50	100	90	3
orth Dakota 67 districts	0	25	90	11
outh Dakota 88 districts	100	100	95	0
tah 0 districts	0	10	50	2
yoming 2 districts	0	9	75	4
EGIONAL VERAGE	33	55	86	4

REGION IX

State/Territory and Number of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs Implementing one of the Evaluation Models In: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistar for SEA personnel i 6/30/77
Arizona 145 districts	5	36	100	6
California 1080 districts	0	1	35	3
Hawaii 7 districts	0	100	100	2
Nevada 17 districts	0	100	100	2
Guam 1 district	100	100	100	0
Trust Territory 6 districts	0	50	0	0
Samoa 1 district	0	100	0	0
REGIONAL AVERAGE	1	7	44	2

REGION X

State and Number of LEAs	Approximate % of LEAs Implementing one of the Evaluation Models In: 1976-77	1977-78	% of LEAs Trained by 6/30/77	Technical Assistan for SEA personnel b 6/30/77
Alaska 51 districts	2	16	100	4
Idaho 103 districts	100	100	100	5
Oregon 332 districts	1	7	40	4
Washington 250 districts	0	32	100	4
REGIONAL AVERAGE	14	29	73	4